Previous references.

1890.

~~190~~ .

(Land Revenue)

Later references.

File No. 50 of 90-9

Serial Nos. 1 - 2.

(10)

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 – 2.

major **Part B. for** 19.8.90.

SUBJECT:

Non-recognition of the sale of Shanbaghue hereditary office

1. 24 714.4.90. From Deputy Commissioner Mysore.
Submits a document in original executed by Shamanna Shanbogh of Kyagi Hobli Hunsur.

2. 5539 719.8.90. To Deputy Commissioner Mysore
298
Informs that the Government cannot recognize the justice of the sale of the Shanboghs but permit Shanboghes to have Sumastas to help them.

G. R. S. 58

Indexed

N. Krishnaswamy

80 Sep Rec 1. of 1890-91

CHIEF SECY.'S DEPT.

SUBMITTED TO THE DEWAN.

For Orders -

Proposed by Cr No 24 of 1890
Admitted

The questions are
(1) Is the Lease sufficiently stamped
(2) Is it for Govt policy to recognize the transfer by a shareholder for a consideration one of the two divisions into which his portion is divided at the transfer of shareholders' shares by the Surveyor Genl of Mysore &c - & for which he is required to appoint a substitute but cannot find a relative who might be appd & who will maintain himself -

Detailed note not submitted

Submitted to the H'ble Dewan

I think that the Document deemed to be treated as a Conveyance & stamped accordingly. —

We cannot refuse regn because the sale is not valid, but I think we may inform the parties who purchased the right that the Govt. does not recognise the sale, & that if they proceed, he would be appointed as a guarantee of the registered Hackdar. — I do not think it a good policy to recognise sales of Hereditary Offices. —

Let
9/8/90

Papers
Draft order as
9/8

Offd
9/8

Learned Chief may properly be asserted hereafter? I see none, & I see no other way for the Operations of the Survey Department ~~to be affected~~ in the matter of Chamberpres' Charges without suspending under the Law on Chamberpres —

Attd
Jervois 90

Before the Other part of the case
put up on record the
file claims a case
in Mysore Taluk (Arsikere
Hobli, named Turka
not ascertained) in which
a Harijan woman claimed
maintenance from
Shamboor Punaata,
the other was that
maintenance was
due from Patil
the Harijan might change
the Patil and nominate
another - Attd
Advocate 15/8/90
was printed - Dt 16 of
a date subsequent to 1887
May Attd 15/8/90

Correct Record
Plan to be
& Let Case

Sir Pro: No 570-77
1930-5-88 Submitted
Move Due Date Attd 17-8-90

4 Sep Rev: 1 of 1890-91
Sl 1.

SECTION L & R. (General Serial No. 29)

FILE No. 30 of 1890-91 From

SERIAL No. 1.

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER & DEWAN OF MYSORE
430
21 APR 90
32

1890 Dep

The documents
though called a Kowl
appears to be in effect
a Deed of Conveyance.
It must be treated
as such & the Stamp duty
should be levied accordingly.

The sale of the
Office of Shanubhogue
is certainly illegal
& cannot be recognized
by the Govt - & the
man could not produce
a relative for one
of the Thirkars Govt
has to take over and

As
submitted
ads
29/4/90

Submd to the Dewan
Ordered letter 1 June
[illegible]

To

The Chief Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ Govt of Mysore.

Dated

Despatched 14th April

Received

Enclosures No. 1 bile

General No. 24
No.

I have the honour to submit in accordance with section 45 of the stamp act of 1879 a document in original dy 16 novem-ber 1889 executed by Shamanna Shanbogue of Kinjaji Kotte in Nunsur Taluk.

A3
21-4-90

Enclosure 8841 Sep. Rev: 1 of 1890-91
Sl 1.

No 24.

Mysore District,
Deputy Commissioner's Office.
Dated. 14th April 1890.

From,

G. J. Meiklejohn Esquire
Deputy Commissioner Mysore.

To,

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

Sir,

In accordance with section 45 of the Stamp Act of 1879 I have the honor to submit for orders of Government a document impounded dated 16th November 1889 executed by Shamanna Shanbogue of Kirjapi Hobli Hunsur Taluk.

2. After the survey Settlement, the 11 villages under his charge have been divided into 2 pirkas and Each pirka had to be held by one individual. The petitioner was therefore asked to select among his

relatives a competent man for one of the Pirkas.

3. The Shanbagne seems from the document in question to have collected one Loobkan for the Shanbogship of the marginally noted villages, and agreed to receive from the Claimant a sum of Rs: 800/- in consideration of the transfer of this Vak of Shanbogship.

4. The document has been executed on 4 Rs: stamp paper instead of as a sale deed, on a 8 Rupee stamp, it was therefore impounded and forwarded to me by the Sub Registrar of Arsikere for determination of stamp duty.

5. As far as the stamp duty goes the document would appear to come under No: 13 of Schedule I of the Stamp act headed "Bonds not otherwise provided for" and to be properly stamped. But

But can such a sale of a Government office be permitted and recognized by Government. The Shanbóg is asked to appoint a relative. He has none to be sales the appointment. I am of opinion that such a sale should not be allowed or recognized.

6. The Correspondence in connection with the document is herewith submitted.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obed[t] servant.

for Deputy Commissioner
Mysore Distt.

W.M.